

1 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)  
2 MJacobs@mofo.com  
3 MATTHEW A. CHIVVIS (CA SBN 251325)  
4 MChivvis@mofo.com  
5 DIEK O. VAN NORT (CA SBN 273823)  
6 DVanNort@mofo.com  
7 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
8 425 Market Street  
9 San Francisco, California 94105-2482  
10 Telephone: (415) 268-7000  
11 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

12 RUDY Y. KIM (CA SBN 199426)  
13 RudyKim@mofo.com  
14 COLETTE REINER MAYER (CA SBN 263630)  
15 CRMayer@mofo.com  
16 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
17 755 Page Mill Road  
18 Palo Alto, California 94304-1018  
19 Telephone: (650) 813-5600  
20 Facsimile: (650) 494-0792

21 Attorneys for Defendant  
22 PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.

23 ROSE S. LEE (CA SBN 294658)  
24 RoseLee@mofo.com  
25 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
26 707 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 6000  
27 Los Angeles, California 90017-3543  
28 Telephone: (213) 892-5200  
Facsimile: (213) 892-5454

29 ERIC W. LIN (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
30 Elin@mofo.com  
31 MICHAEL J. DESTEFANO (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
32 Mdestefano@mofo.com  
33 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
34 250 West 55th Street  
35 New York, New York 10019-9601  
36 Telephone: (212) 468-8000  
37 Facsimile: (212) 468-7900

38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
7710  
7711  
7712  
7713  
7714  
7715  
7716  
7717  
7718  
7719  
7720  
7721  
7722  
7723  
7724  
7725  
7726  
7727  
7728  
7729  
7730  
7731  
7732  
7733  
7734  
7735  
7736  
7737  
7738  
7739  
7740  
7741  
7742  
7743  
7744  
7745  
7746  
7747  
7748  
7749  
7750  
7751  
7752  
7753  
7754  
7755  
7756  
7757  
7758  
7759  
7760  
7761  
7762  
7763  
7764  
7765  
7766  
7767  
7768  
7769  
77610  
77611  
77612  
77613  
77614  
77615  
77616  
77617  
77618  
77619  
77620  
77621  
77622  
77623  
77624  
77625  
77626  
77627  
77628  
77629  
77630  
77631  
77632  
77633  
77634  
77635  
77636  
77637  
77638  
77639  
77640  
77641  
77642  
77643  
77644  
77645  
77646  
77647  
77648  
77649  
77650  
77651  
77652  
77653  
77654  
77655  
77656  
77657  
77658  
77659  
77660  
77661  
77662  
77663  
77664  
77665  
77666  
77667  
77668  
77669  
77670  
77671  
77672  
77673  
77674  
77675  
77676  
77677  
77678  
77679  
77680  
77681  
77682  
77683  
77684  
77685  
77686  
77687  
77688  
77689  
77690  
77691  
77692  
77693  
77694  
77695  
77696  
77697  
77698  
77699  
776100  
776101  
776102  
776103  
776104  
776105  
776106  
776107  
776108  
776109  
776110  
776111  
776112  
776113  
776114  
776115  
776116  
776117  
776118  
776119  
776120  
776121  
776122  
776123  
776124  
776125  
776126  
776127  
776128  
776129  
776130  
776131  
776132  
776133  
776134  
776135  
776136  
776137  
776138  
776139  
776140  
776141  
776142  
776143  
776144  
776145  
776146  
776147  
776148  
776149  
776150  
776151  
776152  
776153  
776154  
776155  
776156  
776157  
776158  
776159  
776160  
776161  
776162  
776163  
776164  
776165  
776166  
776167  
776168  
776169  
776170  
776171  
776172  
776173  
776174  
776175  
776176  
776177  
776178  
776179  
776180  
776181  
776182  
776183  
776184  
776185  
776186  
776187  
776188  
776189  
776190  
776191  
776192  
776193  
776194  
776195  
776196  
776197  
776198  
776199  
776200  
776201  
776202  
776203  
776204  
776205  
776206  
776207  
776208  
776209  
776210  
776211  
776212  
776213  
776214  
776215  
776216  
776217  
776218  
776219  
776220  
776221  
776222  
776223  
776224  
776225  
776226  
776227  
776228  
776229  
776230  
776231  
776232  
776233  
776234  
776235  
776236  
776237  
776238  
776239  
776240  
776241  
776242  
776243  
776244  
776245  
776246  
776247  
776248  
776249  
776250  
776251  
776252  
776253  
776254  
776255  
776256  
776257  
776258  
776259  
776260  
776261  
776262  
776263  
776264  
776265  
776266  
776267  
776268  
776269  
776270  
776271  
776272  
776273  
776274  
776275  
776276  
776277  
776278  
776279  
776280  
776281  
776282  
776283  
776284  
776285  
776286  
776287  
776288  
776289  
776290  
776291  
776292  
776293  
776294  
776295  
776296  
776297  
776298  
776299  
776300  
776301  
776302  
776303  
776304  
776305  
776306  
776307  
776308  
776309  
776310  
776311  
776312  
776313  
776314  
776315  
776316  
776317  
776318  
776319  
776320  
776321  
776322  
776323  
776324  
776325  
776326  
776327  
776328  
776329  
776330  
776331  
776332  
776333  
776334  
776335  
776336  
776337  
776338  
776339  
776340  
776341  
776342  
776343  
776344  
776345  
776346  
776347  
776348  
776349  
776350  
776351  
776352  
776353  
776354  
776355  
776356  
776357  
776358  
776359  
776360  
776361  
776362  
776363  
776364  
776365  
776366  
776367  
776368  
776369  
776370  
776371  
776372  
776373  
776374  
776375  
776376  
776377  
776378  
776379  
776380  
776381  
776382  
776383  
776384  
776385  
776386  
776387  
776388  
776389  
776390  
776391  
776392  
776393  
776394  
776395  
776396  
776397  
776398  
776399  
776400  
776401  
776402  
776403  
776404  
776405  
776406  
776407  
776408  
776409  
776410  
776411  
776412  
776413  
776414  
776415  
776416  
776417  
776418  
776419  
776420  
776421  
776422  
776423  
776424  
776425  
776426  
776427  
776428  
776429  
776430  
776431  
776432  
776433  
776434  
776435  
776436  
776437  
776438  
776439  
776440  
776441  
776442  
776443  
776444  
776445  
776446  
776447  
776448  
776449  
776450  
776451  
776452  
776453  
776454  
776455  
776456  
776457  
776458  
776459  
776460  
776461  
776462  
776463  
776464  
776465  
776466  
776467  
776468  
776469  
776470  
776471  
776472  
776473  
776474  
776475  
776476  
776477  
776478  
776479  
776480  
776481  
776482  
776483  
776484  
776485  
776486  
776487  
776488  
776489  
776490  
776491  
776492  
776493  
776494  
776495  
776496  
776497  
776498  
776499  
776500  
776501  
776502  
776503  
776504  
776505  
776506  
776507  
776508  
776509  
776510  
776511  
776512  
776513  
776514  
776515  
776516  
776517  
776518  
776519  
776520  
776521  
776522  
776523  
776524  
776525  
776526  
776527  
776528  
776529  
776530  
776531  
776532  
776533  
776534  
776535  
776536  
776537  
776538  
776539  
776540  
776541  
776542  
776543  
776544  
776545  
776546  
776547  
776548  
776549  
776550  
776551  
776552  
776553  
776554  
776555  
776556  
776557  
776558  
776559  
776560  
776561  
776562  
776563  
776564  
776565  
776566  
776567  
776568  
776569  
776570  
776571  
776572  
776573  
776574  
776575  
776576  
776577  
776578  
776579  
776580  
776581  
776582  
776583  
776584  
776585  
776586  
776587  
776588  
776589  
776590  
776591  
776592  
776593  
776594  
776595  
776596  
776597  
776598  
776599  
776600  
776601  
776602  
776603  
776604  
776605  
776606  
776607  
776608  
776609  
776610  
776611  
776612  
776613  
776614  
776615  
776616  
776617  
776618  
776619  
776620  
776621  
776622  
776623  
776624  
776625  
776626  
776627  
776628  
776629  
776630  
776631  
776632  
776633  
776634  
776635  
776636  
776637  
776638  
776639  
776640  
776641  
776642  
776643  
776644  
776645  
776646  
776647  
776648  
776649  
776650  
776651  
776652  
776653  
776654  
776655  
776656  
776657  
776658  
776659  
776660  
776661  
776662  
776663  
776664  
776665  
776666  
776667  
776668  
776669  
776670  
776671  
776672  
776673  
776674  
776675  
776676  
776677  
776678  
776679  
776680  
776681  
776682  
776683  
776684  
776685  
776686  
776687  
776688  
776689  
776690  
776691  
776692  
776693  
776694  
776695  
776696  
776697  
776698  
776699  
776700  
776701  
776702  
776703  
776704  
776705  
776706  
776707  
776708  
776709  
776710  
776711  
776712  
776713  
776714  
776715  
776716  
776717  
776718  
776719  
776720  
776721  
776722  
776723  
776724  
776725  
776726  
776727  
776728  
776729  
776730  
776731  
776732  
776733  
776734  
776735  
776736  
776737  
776738  
776739  
776740  
776741  
776742  
776743  
776744  
776745  
776746  
776747  
776748  
776749  
776750  
776751  
776752  
776753  
776754  
776755  
776756  
776757  
776758  
776759  
776760  
776761  
776762  
776763  
776764  
776765  
776766  
776767  
776768  
776769  
776770  
776771  
776772  
776773  
776774  
776775  
776776  
776777  
776778  
776779  
776780  
776781  
776782  
776783  
776784  
776785  
776786  
776787  
776788  
776789  
776790  
776791  
776792  
776793  
776794  
776795  
776796  
776797  
776798  
776799  
776800  
776801  
776802  
776803  
776804  
776805  
776806  
776807  
776808  
776809  
776810  
776811  
776812  
776813  
776814  
776815  
776816  
776817  
776818  
776819  
776820  
776821  
776822  
776823  
776824  
776825  
776826  
776827  
776828  
776829  
776830  
776831  
776832  
77

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>	
2	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION .....	1
3	RELIEF REQUESTED .....	1
4	STATEMENT OF ISSUES .....	1
5	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES .....	1
6	I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
7	II. BACKGROUND .....	3
8	III. LEGAL STANDARD .....	4
9	IV. ARGUMENTS.....	5
10	A. Finjan’s Screenshots and Generic Statements Do Not Contain Sufficient Detail to Provide Notice of Its Infringement Theories .....	5
11	B. Finjan’s General References to Source Code Filenames Fail to Provide PAN with Notice of Finjan’s Infringement Theories.....	10
12	1. Patent Local Rule 3-1 and the Governing Case Law Require Finjan to Provide Pinpoint Citations to Source Code.....	10
13	2. Finjan Has Had A Sufficient Opportunity to Review the Source Code.....	12
14	3. Courts in This District Have Repeatedly Ordered Finjan to Provide Pinpoint Citations to Source Code .....	13
15	C. Finjan’s Conclusory Doctrine of Equivalents Contentions Fail to Provide PAN with Notice of Finjan’s Infringement Theories.....	14
16	V. CONCLUSION .....	16

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Bender v. Maxim Integrated Prods., Inc.</i> , No. C09-01152 SI, 2010 WL 1135762 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 22, 2010) .....	5
<i>Big Baboon Corp. v. Dell, Inc.</i> , 723 F. Supp. 2d 1224 (C.D. Cal. 2010).....	11
<i>Creagri, Inc. v. Pinnaclife Inc., LLC</i> , No. 11-CV-06635-LHK-PSG, 2012 WL 5389775 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 2, 2012) .....	14
<i>CSR Tech. Inc. v. Freescale Semiconductor</i> , No. C-12-02619 RS (JSC), 2013 WL 503077 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 8, 2013) .....	15
<i>Diagnostic Sys. Corp. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , No. SACV 06-1211 DOC, 2009 WL 1607717 (C.D. Cal. June 5, 2009) .....	12
<i>Digital Reg of Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.</i> , No. CV 12-01971-CW (KAW), 2013 WL 3361241 (N.D. Cal. July 3, 2013) .....	16
<i>Droplets, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , No. C12-03733 HRL, 2013 WL 1563256 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 12, 2013) .....	7, 11
<i>Finjan LLC v. ESET, LLC</i> , No. 17-cv-0183-CAB-BGS, 2021 WL 2012248 (S.D. Cal. May 20, 2021).....	3
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Check Point Software Techs., Inc.</i> , No. 18-CV-02621-WHO, Dkt. No. 29 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 10, 2018).....	14
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Check Point Software Techs., Inc.</i> , No. 18-CV-02621-WHO, 2019 WL 955000 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 27, 2019)..... <i>passim</i>	
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 17-cv-00072-BLF (SVK), Dkt. No. 696 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 12, 2017) .....	2
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. FireEye, Inc.</i> , No. 13-cv-03133-SBA (JCS), Dkt. No. 134 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 16, 2017) .....	2, 14
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Proofpoint, Inc.</i> , No. 13-CV-05808-HSG, 2015 WL 1517920 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2015)..... <i>passim</i>	
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Proofpoint, Inc.</i> , No. 13-CV-05808-HSG, 2015 WL 9023166 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2015).....	14
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. SonicWall, Inc.</i> , No. 17-CV-04467-BLF(VKD), 2019 WL 2077849 (N.D. Cal. May 10, 2019) .....	2, 11

1	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Sophos, Inc.</i> , No. 14-CV-01197-WHO, 2015 WL 13728796 (N.D. Cal. July 14, 2015).....	5
2		
3	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Sophos, Inc.</i> , No. 14-CV-01197-WHO, 2015 WL 5012679 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 24, 2015).....	2, 13, 15
4		
5	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Zscaler, Inc.</i> , No. 17-CV-06946-JST, 2018 WL 4181906 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2018), <i>enforcement granted</i> , 2019 WL 7589210 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 5, 2019) .....	2, 4, 9
6		
7	<i>Genentech, Inc. v. The Trs. of Univ. of Pa.</i> , No. C 10-02037-LHK (PSG), 2010 WL 11509141 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 13, 2010).....	10
8		
9	<i>Geovector Corp. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 16-CV-02463-WHO, 2017 WL 76950 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2017) .....	16
10		
11	<i>Implicit Networks Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , No. C 10-03746 SI, 2011 WL 3954809 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 7, 2011).....	14
12		
13	<i>Network Caching Tech. LLC v. Novell Inc.</i> , No. 01-cv-2079-VRW, 2002 WL 32126128 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2002).....	5, 7, 15
14		
15	<i>Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus Am., Inc.</i> , No. C 12-5967 PJH, 2013 WL 11319414 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2013) .....	4
16		
17	<i>Theranos, Inc. v. Fuisz Pharma LLC</i> , No. 11-CV-05236-YGR, 2012 WL 6000798 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 30, 2012).....	5
18		
19	<b>Other Authorities</b>	
20	Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) .....	1
21		
22	Patent L.R. 3-1 .....	<i>passim</i>
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

## **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**

**TO ALL PARTIES AND COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on July 22, 2021, at 1:30 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Oakland Division, located at 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, CA 94612, in Courtroom 3 before the Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton, Defendant Palo Alto Networks, Inc. (“PAN”) will and hereby does submit its motion to move the Court for an Order striking Plaintiff Finjan LLC’s (“Finjan”) infringement contentions (“Motion”).

This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, all documents in the Court's file, any matters of which this Court may take judicial notice, and on such other written and oral argument as may be presented to the Court.

## **RELIEF REQUESTED**

Pursuant to Patent Local Rule 3-1 and Rule 12(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, PAN seeks an Order from the Court striking the infringement contentions served by Finjan.

## **STATEMENT OF ISSUES**

Whether Finjan's infringement contentions fail to meet the standards set forth in Patent Local Rule 3-1 and fail to provide PAN with adequate notice of Finjan's theories of infringement, and should therefore be stricken.

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Despite Finjan’s having had access to PAN’s source code for *over twelve months*, Finjan fails to identify with any particularity how each of PAN’s accused products infringe each asserted claim. First, Finjan’s infringement contentions merely parrot claim language and make generic statements about PAN’s products, followed by pages of haphazard screenshots. Finjan makes no attempt to link the claims to specific features or functions of the accused products described in PAN’s documents or source code. Second, Finjan cites entire source code files, comprising millions of lines of code, without pinpointing any line numbers that allegedly satisfy each claim

1 limitation. Given the sheer volume of source code cited, without pinpoint citations, PAN has no  
2 way of knowing where and how Finjan contends each limitation of each asserted claim is found  
3 within each PAN product. Third, Finjan asserts the doctrine of equivalents in a conclusory  
4 manner without explaining where in PAN's products the alleged equivalent for the element is  
5 found, and how the function, way, and result of that alleged equivalent is substantially the same  
6 as the claimed subject matter.

7 Finjan is well aware of the level of detail required to satisfy Patent Local Rule 3-1.  
8 Indeed, ***in at least seven cases***, courts in this district have held that Finjan violated Patent Local  
9 Rule 3-1 by serving infringement contentions that fail to provide notice of its infringement  
10 theories.<sup>1</sup> In fact, with respect to the specific issue of pinpoint citations, Finjan has already been  
11 ordered to provide pinpoint citations. *See, e.g., Check Point*, 2019 WL 955000, at \*7. Otherwise,  
12 “the way Finjan frames its source code citations creates incalculable alternatives of infringement  
13 theories and it is next to impossible to know what its infringement theories are.” *Id.* Despite  
14 these prior rulings, and despite PAN’s willingness during the meet and confer process to not  
15 oppose Finjan’s serving amended contentions if it provided the required detail, Finjan refused.  
16 Finjan’s failure to provide sufficient infringement contentions amounts to nothing more than

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., *Finjan, Inc. v. SonicWall, Inc.*, No. 17-CV-04467-BLF(VKD), 2019 WL  
20 2077849, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. May 10, 2019) (Demarchi, Mag.) (ordering Finjan to amend  
infringement contentions); *Finjan, Inc. v. Check Point Software Techs., Inc.*, No. 18-CV-02621-  
21 WHO, 2019 WL 955000, at \*8-9 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 27, 2019) (Orrick, J.) (ordering Finjan to  
provide source code citations and amend infringement contentions); *Finjan, Inc. v. Zscaler, Inc.*,  
22 No. 17-CV-06946-JST, 2018 WL 4181906, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2018) (Tigar, J.) (“The  
Court agrees the contentions as a whole are insufficient to put Zscaler on notice of how its  
products specifically infringe the patent claims at issue.”), *enforcement granted*, 2019 WL  
23 7589210 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 5, 2019); *Finjan, Inc. v. FireEye, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-03133-SBA (JCS),  
Dkt. No. 134 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 16, 2017) (Spero, Mag.) (“Finjan shall provide pinpoint source code  
24 citations in its Infringement Contentions.”) (Decl. of Diek Van Nort, filed herewith (“Van Nort  
Decl.”) Ex. 1); *Finjan, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, No. 17-cv-00072-BLF (SVK), Dkt. No. 696 (N.D.  
Cal. Oct. 12, 2017) (van Keulen, Mag.) (ordering Finjan to amend its infringement contentions  
25 “across the board”) (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 2 at 77-78); *Finjan, Inc. v. Sophos, Inc.*, No. 14-CV-  
01197-WHO, 2015 WL 5012679, at \*6 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 24, 2015) (Orrick, J.) (ordering Finjan to  
26 provide source code citations and amend infringement contentions); *Finjan, Inc. v. Proofpoint,  
Inc.*, No. 13-CV-05808-HSG, 2015 WL 1517920, at \* 6-10 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 2, 2015) (Gilliam, J.)  
27 (finding that “Finjan’s infringement contentions do not satisfy the requirements of Patent Local  
Rule 3-1(c).”).

1 gamesmanship and it is prejudicing PAN’s ability to prepare its defense. This Court should strike  
 2 Finjan’s infringement contentions in their entirety.

3           **II. BACKGROUND**

4           Finjan served its infringement contentions on April 1, 2021. (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 3.)  
 5 These contentions assert infringement of seven patents: U.S. Patent No. 6,804,780 (the “’780  
 6 Patent”), U.S. Patent No. 7,418,731 (the “’731 Patent”), U.S. Patent No. 7,613,926 (the “’926  
 7 Patent”), U.S. Patent No. 7,647,633 (the “’633 Patent”), U.S. Patent No. 8,141,154 (the “’154  
 8 Patent”), U.S. Patent No. 8,225,408 (the “’408 Patent”), and U.S. Patent No. 8,677,494 (the “’494  
 9 Patent”). (*Id.* at 1-2.) On May 27, 2021, in light of Judge Bencivengo’s May 20 judgment in  
 10 *Finjan LLC v. ESET, LLC*,<sup>2</sup> Finjan agreed to dismiss the ’780, ’494, and ’926 Patents.<sup>3</sup> (Van  
 11 Nort Decl. Ex. 4.) Therefore, only four patents, the ’633, ’731, ’408, and ’154 Patents, remain at  
 12 issue in this case (“the patents-in-suit”).

13           Finjan’s infringement contentions accuse the following PAN products of infringing the  
 14 patents-in-suit: Next Generation Firewall Products (“NGFW”), WildFire Subscription  
 15 (“WildFire”), Traps and Cortex XDR (“Traps”), Threat Prevention, and URL Filtering. (Van  
 16 Nort Decl. Ex. 3 at 2-4.) Finjan served one claim chart each for the ’633, ’731<sup>4</sup>, and ’408 Patents,  
 17 and two claim charts for the ’154 Patent—one entitled “Infringement Chart for U.S. Patent No.  
 18 8,141,154 and NGFW, WildFire, Threat Prevention, and URL Filtering Products” (Van Nort  
 19 Decl. Ex. 6, “Appendix E-1”), and the other “Infringement Chart for U.S. Patent No. 8,141,154  
 20 and Traps (Cortex XDR) and WildFire.” (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 7, “Appendix E-2.”) The five  
 21 claim charts are largely filled with narrative, high-level descriptions of Finjan’s infringement  
 22 theory, pages of screenshots without any explanation or reference back to the alleged

---

24           <sup>2</sup> *Finjan LLC v. ESET, LLC*, No. 17-cv-0183-CAB-BGS, 2021 WL 2012248 (S.D. Cal.  
 25 May 20, 2021).

26           <sup>3</sup> The parties are working towards a joint stipulation that would dismiss the ’780, ’494,  
 27 and ’926 Patents.

28           <sup>4</sup> An excerpt of the claim chart for the ’731 Patent (“Appendix B-1”) is attached as Exhibit  
 5 to the accompanying Van Nort Declaration.

1 infringement theory, and general citations to source code filenames—totaling millions of lines of  
 2 code—with no pin cites. These contentions do not provide PAN with reasonable notice of  
 3 Finjan’s infringement theories.

4 On May 12, 2021, PAN wrote Finjan identifying: (1) Finjan’s failure to provide source  
 5 code pinpoint citations; (2) Finjan’s deficient doctrine of equivalents contentions; and (3) patent-  
 6 to-patent deficiencies. (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 8.) PAN also provided Finjan with an opportunity to  
 7 amend its infringement contentions to address these failures. (*Id.* at 2.) Finjan responded on May  
 8 27, 2021. (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 9.) It refused to address any of the deficiencies PAN identified.  
 9 Instead, it “disagree[d] with [PAN’s] assertions that Finjan’s contentions are in any way  
 10 deficient.” (*Id.* at 1). The parties held a meet and confer via video conference on May 28, 2021  
 11 concerning these contentions. (Van Nort Decl. ¶ 12.) During the meet and confer, the parties  
 12 reached an impasse when Finjan again disputed that its contentions were deficient and refused to  
 13 provide pinpoint citations in the source code—stating that they were not required—and refused to  
 14 remedy the other deficiencies. (*Id.*)

### 15 III. LEGAL STANDARD

16 “To satisfy Patent Local Rule 3–1, [Finjan] must compare an accused product to its  
 17 patents on a claim by claim, element by element basis for at least one of each [PAN’s] products.”  
 18 *Zscaler*, 2018 WL 4181906, at \*1 (internal citation and quotation marks omitted). “Patent Local  
 19 Rule 3-1 is intended to require the plaintiff to crystallize its theories of the case early in the  
 20 litigation and to adhere to those theories once disclosed.” *Check Point*, 2019 WL 955000, at \* 3  
 21 (internal citations and quotation marks omitted).

22 “[A]ll courts agree that the degree of specificity under Local Rule 3–1 must be sufficient  
 23 to provide reasonable notice to the defendant [as to] why the plaintiff believes it has a ‘reasonable  
 24 chance of proving infringement.’” *Proofpoint*, 2015 WL 1517920, at \*2 (quoting *Shared  
 25 Memory Graphics LLC v. Apple, Inc.*, 812 F.Supp.2d 1022, 1025 (N.D. Cal.2010)). “At the  
 26 Patent Local Rule 3-1 Disclosure stage, [Finjan] must put forth information so specific that either  
 27 reverse engineering or its equivalent is required.” *Id.* at \*6 (internal citation and quotation marks  
 28 omitted); *see also Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus Am., Inc.*, No. C 12-5967 PJH,

1 2013 WL 11319414, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2013) (Hamilton, J.). Infringement contentions  
 2 that merely “parrot[] claim language or reference[] screenshots and/or website content” are  
 3 insufficient. *Proofpoint*, 2015 WL 1517920, at \*6. Instead, Finjan “bears the burden of  
 4 providing infringement contentions that specify the location of every claim element within the  
 5 accused products.” *Bender v. Maxim Integrated Prods., Inc.*, No. C09-01152 SI, 2010 WL  
 6 1135762, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 22, 2010).

7 Infringement contentions that do not meet the requirements of Patent Local Rule 3-1 are  
 8 subject to a motion to strike. *See, e.g., Theranos, Inc. v. Fuisz Pharma LLC*, No. 11-CV-05236-  
 9 YGR, 2012 WL 6000798, at \*7 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 30, 2012) (granting motion to strike and  
 10 requiring patentee to file a motion for leave to amend in order to serve revised contentions). A  
 11 “motion to strike is not a discovery dispute.” *Finjan, Inc. v. Sophos, Inc.*, No. 14-CV-01197-  
 12 WHO, 2015 WL 13728796, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. July 14, 2015) (denying Finjan’s administrative  
 13 motion to compel Sophos to comply with Judge Orrick’s standing order regarding discovery  
 14 disputes).

#### 15 IV. ARGUMENTS

##### 16 A. **Finjan’s Screenshots and Generic Statements Do Not Contain 17 Sufficient Detail to Provide Notice of Its Infringement Theories**

18 Finjan’s infringement contentions are largely comprised of screenshots with little to no  
 19 explanation. This approach is routinely rejected by courts in this district. *See Proofpoint*, 2015  
 20 WL 1517920, at \*6. The little explanation that Finjan does provide is framed in high-level  
 21 generalities about PAN’s products and lacks citations back to the screenshots that it does include.  
 22 These generalities do not help identify what features or functions of the accused products  
 23 purportedly meet each claim limitation. Finjan’s screenshots and generic statements about PAN’s  
 24 products therefore do not meet the level of specificity required by Patent Local Rule 3-1. *See*  
 25 *Network Caching Tech. LLC v. Novell Inc.*, No. 01-cv-2079-VRW, 2002 WL 32126128, at \*4  
 26 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2002) (rejecting infringement contentions where the patentee “provides no  
 27 explanation of how the proxies described in the literature map onto the claim language.”).

28 Finjan’s claim charts for the ’154 Patent are representative of the deficiencies of Finjan’s  
 PAN’S MOTION TO STRIKE FINJAN’S INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS  
 CASE NO. 4:14-CV-04908-PJH

1 infringement contentions.<sup>5</sup> For example, claim 1[a] of the '154 Patent discloses:

2 a content processor (i) for processing content received over a  
 3 network, the content including a call to a first function, and the call  
 4 including an input, and (ii) for invoking a second function within  
 the input, only if a security computer indicates that such invocation  
 is safe;

5 (Appendix E-1 at 10.)

6 As an example, Finjan offers no explanation of what a “first function” is. Although  
 7 Finjan’s '154 infringement charts total 467 pages and use the term “first function” hundreds of  
 8 times, not once does Finjan explain what a “first function” *actually is* in the accused products.  
 9 Instead, Finjan cites to pages of screenshots that have no apparent connection to a “first function.”  
 10 As shown below, Finjan cites to screenshots and claims that “NGFW can insert **substitute**  
 11 **functionality (first functions)** into email content and various other forms of received content to  
 cause it to be sent to a security computer (WildFire) for analysis.” (emphasis added).

Claim 1[a]	Support
	<p>/HTTPS links contained in SMTP or POP3 messages. If a user downloads a file sample over a session that matches the security rule, the firewall performs a file hash check with WildFire to determine if WildFire has previously analyzed the sample. If the file is new, it is forwarded for analysis, even if it is contained within a ZIP file or over compressed HTTP. In the case of an email link, the firewall will extract HTTP /HTTPS links from SMTP and POP3 email messages that match the forwarding policy and will forward the link to WildFire (see WildFire Email Link Analysis. You can also configure the firewall to forward files inside of encrypted SSL sessions if SSL decryption is enabled.”</p> <p><b>File/Email Link Forwarding</b></p> <p>With the integrated solution between WildFire and Palo Alto Networks firewalls, you configure the firewall with a file blocking profile and attach it to a security policy rule that instructs the firewall to automatically forward samples to the WildFire system for threat analysis. The samples can be specific file types or HTTP/HTTPS links contained in SMTP or POP3 messages. If a user downloads a file sample over a session that matches the security rule, the firewall performs a file hash check with WildFire to determine if WildFire has previously analyzed the sample. If the file is new, it is forwarded for analysis, even if it is contained within a ZIP file or over compressed HTTP. In the case of an email link, the firewall will extract HTTP /HTTPS links from SMTP and POP3 email messages that match the forwarding policy and will forward the link to WildFire (see WildFire Email Link Analysis. You can also configure the firewall to forward files inside of encrypted SSL sessions if SSL decryption is enabled.</p> <p>PAN_FIN 00000623 at PAN_FIN00000633.</p> <p>NGFW can insert substitute functionality (first functions) into email content and various other forms of received content to cause it to be sent to a security computer (WildFire) for analysis.</p>

21 (Appendix E-1 at 51 (emphasis added).)

---

22

23

24       <sup>5</sup> As explained herein, Finjan’s infringement contentions are voluminous in pages but  
 25 empty in the required substance. For purposes of preserving judicial economy, PAN has included  
 just the two excerpted claim charts for the '154 Patent and an excerpted claim chart for the '731  
 26 Patent as exhibits to this Motion. The remaining claim charts are deficient for the same reasons.  
 PAN identified the specific deficiencies in each of the claim charts for the remaining patents in its  
 May 12, 2021 letter (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 8), but Finjan similarly denies that they are deficient,  
 27 and maintains that pinpoint citations to source code are not necessary. (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 9 at  
 2-3.) Upon request, PAN can file the complete versions of all claim charts served by Finjan.

Claim 1[a]	Support
	<p style="color: #6aa84f;"><b>Supported File Types</b></p> <p>WildFire can analyze the following file types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Email-link</b>—HTTP/HTTPS email links contained in SMTP and POP3 email messages. Note that the firewall only extracts links and associated session information (sender, recipient, and subject) from the email messages that traverse the firewall; it does not receive, store, forward, or view the email message. The WF-500 appliance does not support email link analysis.</li> <li>• <b>Flash</b>—Adobe Flash applets and Flash content embedded in web pages</li> <li>• <b>APK</b>—Android Application Package. Not supported on the WF-500 appliance.</li> <li>• <b>PDF</b>—Portable Document Format</li> </ul> <p>PAN_FIN 00000623 at PAN_FIN00000633.</p>

(*Id.* at 52.) But the screenshots do not mention a “first function” at all. They describe generally how PAN’s WildFire products work with different files, but do not provide any guidance on what a “first function” is or how PAN’s products insert this “first function.” Finjan also summarily equates “first functions” with “substitute functionality,” but similarly provides no information on what a “substitute functionality” is or how PAN’s products insert this “substitute functionality.” The screenshots also do not mention any “substitute functionality.” These screenshots and Finjan’s sparse explanation do not disclose any cogent infringement theory. *Proofpoint*, 2015 WL 1517920, at \*6-10; *Droplets, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, No. C12-03733 HRL, 2013 WL 1563256, at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 12, 2013) (noting that “some association between the evidence and the language used in the claim limitations is necessary to understand where each claim limitation is found within the Accused Product”); *Network Caching*, 2002 WL 32126128, at \*6 (striking infringement contentions because “NCT provides no link between the quoted passages and the infringement contention that simply mimics the language of the claim. . . . In essence, NCT has provided no further information to defendants than the claim language itself.”).

Similarly, Finjan never identifies where a “second function” is allegedly found in the accused products. Again, Finjan’s infringement charts merely parrot claim language and cite to screenshots that bear no link to a “second function.” (*See, e.g.*, Appendix E-2 at 67-82.)

Finjan also fails to identify “input.” In one of the infringement charts for the ’154 chart, Finjan repeatedly conflates “input” with “content,” despite the two being separate claim elements. (*See, e.g.*, Appendix E-1 at 13 (“the NGFW sends **content (inputs)** to WildFire for analysis.”))

1 (emphasis added).) In its other infringement chart, Finjan either uses the term “input” without  
 2 describing “input” at all (*see, e.g.*, Appendix E-2 at 38-41), or merely identifies a generic example  
 3 “input” without identifying a “first function” or “second function” that is related to the “input.”  
 4 (*See, e.g., id.* at 88.)

5 As Judge Gilliam stated in his *Proofpoint* decision addressing the above claim limitations,  
 6 “in order to satisfy Patent Local Rule 3–1(c) as to Claim 1a, Finjan was required to identify what  
 7 structure, act, or material in each of the [accused products] infringes each claim element. In other  
 8 words, what constitutes the ‘first function,’ ‘second function,’ and the ‘input’ in the allegedly  
 9 infringing [accused products]?” *Proofpoint*, 2015 WL 1517920, at \*7. Judge Gilliam found that  
 10 “[t]hese are questions that Finjan’s infringement contentions do not answer.” *Id.* And the same is  
 11 true here. “If Finjan believes that the first and second functions [and input] are contained within  
 12 the [accused products], it was obligated to say so explicitly in its infringement contentions.  
 13 Neither the Court nor [PAN] should be required to guess which aspects of the accused products  
 14 allegedly infringe each claim element.” *Id.*

15 Besides “first function,” “second function,” and “input,” Finjan’s infringement  
 16 contentions also do not properly identify “content processor” or “security computer.”<sup>6</sup> For  
 17 example, in one of the claim charts for the ’154 Patent, under “NGFW + WildFire + Threat  
 18 Prevention,” Finjan alleges that “[t]he accused content processor is comprised of structures,  
 19 functionalities, operations, or systems of NGFW and Threat Prevention, together, or in  
 20 combination with a client computer.” (Appendix E-1 at 12.) Finjan also alleges that “the accused  
 21 security computer is comprised of structures, functionalities, operations, or systems of WildFire

---

22

23         <sup>6</sup> Contrary to Finjan’s apparent belief, *volume* does not equal *specificity*. *See, e.g.*,  
 24 *Proofpoint*, 2015 WL 1517920 at \*6 (“Finjan’s infringement contentions are largely comprised of  
 25 generic marketing literature and screenshots of the type routinely rejected by courts in this  
 26 District. These unexplained references comprise the majority of Finjan’s over 1,000 pages of  
 27 claim charts.”). In Finjan’s May 27, 2021 letter to PAN, Finjan stated that it “identified the  
 28 infringing functionalities and structures of the accused products that correspond with the claimed  
 ‘content processors.’” (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 9 at 5.) Finjan then boasted that it “laid out over 175  
 pages of explanations of the various infringing functionalities of the content processors within the  
 PAN Accused Instrumentalities,” without ever specifying the structures or components of PAN’s  
 accused products that correspond to “the accused content processor.” (*Id.*)

1 and/or Threat Prevention.” (*Id.*) But that open-ended description is not helpful at all. PAN’s  
 2 NGFW, WildFire, and Threat Prevention products contain thousands of structures, functionalities,  
 3 operations, or systems. Finjan’s allegations therefore include an infinite number of possible  
 4 combinations. Finjan cannot merely “provide[] generic allegations that do not identify specific  
 5 components of the product or products[.]” *Zscaler*, 2018 WL 4181906, at \*2 (quoting *Bender v.*  
 6 *Infineon Techs. N. Am. Corp.*, No. C09-02112JW (HRL), 2010 WL 964197, at \*2 (N.D. Cal.  
 7 Mar. 16, 2010)) (internal alterations omitted). Additionally, “[i]f Finjan believes that [PAN’s]  
 8 underlying instrumentalities infringe in combination, Finjan must specify the combination.”  
 9 *Check Point*, 2019 WL 955000, at \*4.

10 These are just some examples of Finjan’s failure to identify any theory of infringement for  
 11 the asserted claim limitation. There are many other examples throughout Finjan’s infringement  
 12 contentions, all of which were identified by PAN to Finjan in writing leading up to the meet and  
 13 confer process. Indeed, Finjan fails to identify any theory of infringement for numerous  
 14 limitations in each asserted claim of each patent-in-suit. Below is an exemplary list of claim  
 15 limitations for which Finjan has failed to identify any cogent, specific theory for how the accused  
 16 products satisfy these claim limitations:

<u>Patent</u>	<u>Asserted Claim Limitation</u>
'154 Patent	“content processor” “security computer” “first function” “second function” “input” “content”
'731 Patent	“a file cached for storing files that have been scanned by the scanner for future access, wherein each of the stored files is indexed by a file identifier” “a security profile cache for storing the security profiles derived by the scanner, wherein each of the security profiles is indexed in the security profile cache by a file identifier associated with a corresponding file stored in the file cache”
'633 Patent	“mobile protection code” “downloadable-information destination”

<u>Patent</u>	<u>Asserted Claim Limitation</u>
'408 Patent	<p>“instantiating, by the computer, a scanner for the specific programming language”</p> <p>“in response to said determining, the scanner comprising parser rules and analyzer rules for the specific programming language, wherein the parser rules define certain patterns in terms of tokens, tokens being lexical constructs for the specific programming language, and wherein the analyzer rules identify certain combinations of tokens and patterns as being indicators for potential exploits”</p> <p>“identifying, by the computer, individual tokens within the incoming stream”</p> <p>“dynamically building, by the computer while said receiving receives the incoming stream, a parse tree whose nodes represent tokens and patterns in accordance with the parser rules”</p> <p>“dynamically detecting, by the computer while said dynamically building builds the parse tree, combinations of nodes in the parse tree which are indicators of potential exploits, based on the analyzer rules”</p>

13

14        **B. Finjan’s General References to Source Code Filenames Fail to Provide  
PAN with Notice of Finjan’s Infringement Theories**

15        Perhaps knowing that its screenshots and general statements about PAN’s products do not  
16 satisfy Patent Local Rule 3-1, Finjan includes citations of source code filenames to “identify” the  
17 location of the asserted limitation in PAN’s products. But its citations to source code filenames  
18 do not cure its deficiencies.

19        **1. Patent Local Rule 3-1 and the Governing Case Law Require  
Finjan to Provide Pinpoint Citations to Source Code**

21        Patent Local Rule 3-1 requires Finjan to explain “where and how each limitation of each  
22 asserted claim is found” within each accused product. Patent L. R. 3-1(c). When this accused  
23 product “includes computer software based upon source code made available to the patentee,  
24 patentees must provide ‘pinpoint citations’ to the code identifying the location of each  
25 limitation.” *Genentech, Inc. v. The Trs. of Univ. of Pa.*, No. C 10–02037-LHK (PSG), 2010 WL  
26 11509141, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 13, 2010); *see also Check Point*, 2019 WL 955000, at \*6.  
27 Finjan’s general citations to filenames fail to provide the required specificity for infringement

1 contentions. In each of its charts, Finjan has listed “source code” sections that are merely  
 2 filenames that Finjan alleges to contain the code responsible for practicing the claim limitations.  
 3 For example, for element 1[a] of the ’154 patent, Finjan cites over 100 individual filenames  
 4 covering over 275,000 lines of source code without identifying any line numbers, functions,  
 5 operations, or variable names. (Appendix E-1 at 163-194.) And that is just for one element of  
 6 one claim of one patent. Neither the Court nor PAN should be required to comb through over  
 7 275,000 lines of source code to guess which lines allegedly infringe one single claim element of  
 8 one patent. *Proofpoint*, 2015 WL 1517920, at \*7 (“Neither the Court nor the Defendants should  
 9 be required to guess which aspects of the accused products allegedly infringe each claim  
 10 element.”).

11 Finjan also does not explain how the source code informs its infringement contentions.  
 12 For each citation to source code, Finjan provides the following language before listing a large  
 13 number of source code filenames: “Within the [accused product] source code, the modules that  
 14 implement the operations of [claim language] … are implemented by source code in the  
 15 following files[.]” (*See, e.g.*, Appendix E-1 at 163.) But Finjan’s boilerplate language that the  
 16 asserted claim limitation is implemented by source code within the dozens of listed source code  
 17 files does not explain how any source code within the files—even if PAN can guess where the  
 18 code is—satisfies the alleged claim limitation. *See, e.g.*, *Droplets*, 2013 WL 1563256, at \*3-5  
 19 (“In instances where [the patentee] includes source code or tools, the source code or tools lack  
 20 meaning unless somehow linked with the language of the claim limitations.”); *SonicWall*, 2019  
 21 WL 2077849, at \*6 (“It is not sufficient for Finjan to simply declare that a component that  
 22 performs the claimed functionality exists in an accused instrumentality; Finjan must identify the  
 23 infringing element and where it is found.”).

24 Finjan’s failure to provide pinpoint citations is striking given how little the rest of its  
 25 infringement contentions explain Finjan’s theories of infringement. *See supra* Section IV. A.  
 26 Without pinpoint citations or any mapping of the claim limitations onto the source code, PAN has  
 27 no way of knowing Finjan’s infringement theories.

## **2. Finjan Has Had A Sufficient Opportunity to Review the Source Code**

PAN's source code was available for inspection to Finjan for over twelve months prior to the Patent Local Rule 3-1 deadline. “[T]he authority is clear that a plaintiff should provide citations once a plaintiff has had a sufficient opportunity to review the source code[.]”

*Vasudevan Software, Inc. v. Int'l Bus. Machines Corp.*, No. C09-05897 RS (HRL), 2011 WL 940263, at \*7 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2011). “The bottom line is that, after a plaintiff-patentee has had a reasonable opportunity to review the source code for the defendant’s accused software product, the patentee’s time for trolling the proverbial waters for a theory of infringement comes to an end, and the patentee must fish or cut bait with respect to its specific theory of infringement by providing [Preliminary Infringement Contentions] to the defendant that clearly identify and explain how the source code for the accused product infringes upon specific claims for the patent-in-suit.” *Diagnostic Sys. Corp. v. Symantec Corp.*, No. SACV 06-1211 DOC (ANX), 2009 WL 1607717, at \*5 (C.D. Cal. June 5, 2009).

Finjan has had plenty of time to review PAN’s source code. Before the stay in December 2015, Finjan had access to PAN’s source code for over nine months. On March 4, 2015, and again on April 10, 2015, PAN provided notice to Finjan that PAN’s source code was available for inspection. (Van Nort Decl. Exs. 10, 11.) After the Court lifted the stay in January 2021, PAN has worked diligently to accommodate Finjan’s continued review of PAN’s source code. On February 5, 2021, PAN informed Finjan that PAN’s source code would be available for inspection starting on February 16. (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 12.) On February 23, 2021, Finjan began its re-review of PAN’s source code. (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 13.) On March 10, 2021, PAN produced newer versions of PAN’s source code for review, even though PAN maintains that Finjan has not sufficiently explained how this source code is relevant to this case. (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 14)

That Finjan has had access to PAN’s source code for a total of over twelve months, and refuses to provide pinpoint citations, is unacceptable under applicable case law. *See, e.g.*, *Diagnostic Sys.*, 2009 WL 1607717, at \*4 (“**Eleven months** is more than a reasonable period of

1 time.”) (citing *Am. Video Graphics, L.P. v. Elec. Arts, Inc.*, 359 F. Supp. 2d 558, 561 (E.D. Tex.  
 2 2005) (ordering plaintiff to supplement its claim charts “with specific references to the source  
 3 code within **30 days** of Defendants depositing the code into escrow”) (emphasis added)); *Big*  
 4 *Baboon Corp. v. Dell, Inc.*, 723 F. Supp. 2d 1224, 1228 (C.D. Cal. 2010) (ordering pinpoint  
 5 citations to source code where Amazon provided Big Baboon with the source code for its accused  
 6 programs over four months before the motion to compel adequate infringement contentions).

7 Moreover, this is not the first time that PAN has raised the issue of pinpoint citations.  
 8 PAN first informed Finjan that it is “required to provide pinpoint citations to source code in its  
 9 infringement contentions” over six years ago on April 14, 2015. (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 15.) And  
 10 again on May 11, 2015 and September 1, 2015, PAN reiterated that Patent Local Rule 3 and the  
 11 governing case law require Finjan to provide pinpoint citations to source code in its infringement  
 12 contentions. (Van Nort Decl. Exs. 16, 17.) PAN also raised this issue in the December 3, 2015  
 13 Joint Case Management Statement. (Dkt. No. 62 at 24.) After the stay was lifted, in the March  
 14 11, 2021 Joint Case Management Statement, PAN requested that the Court order Finjan to  
 15 provide pinpoint citations to source code, citing Finjan’s “history of providing deficient  
 16 infringement contentions even when it has been afforded the opportunity to review the source  
 17 code underlying the accused products.” (Dkt. No. 104 at 23-25.) Although the Court said that  
 18 PAN’s request was premature at the Case Management Conference because Finjan had not yet  
 19 served its infringement contentions (Van Nort Decl. ¶ 21), the issue is now ripe. Exactly what  
 20 PAN had feared would happen has occurred: Finjan once again served deficient infringement  
 21 contentions that fail to inform how the source code maps onto the specific claim language of the  
 22 asserted claims.

23                   **3. Courts in This District Have Repeatedly Ordered Finjan to**  
 24 **Provide Pinpoint Citations to Source Code**

25 Finjan is aware that its failure to provide pinpoint citations violates Patent Local Rule 3-1,  
 26 as applied by the Northern District of California. In at least three cases, courts in this district  
 27 have ordered Finjan to provide pinpoint source code citations. *See, e.g., Check Point*, 2019 WL  
 28 955000, at \*6 (“It is Finjan’s obligation to identify the particular claim components in each claim,

1 map those components onto the features of the allegedly infringing products, and pinpoint cite  
 2 source code that practices that component.”); *Sophos*, 2015 WL 5012679, at \*3 (ordering Finjan  
 3 to provide pinpoint source code citations, including “the actual full directory paths, file names,  
 4 function or procedure names and line numbers”) (internal alterations omitted); *FireEye* (Van Nort  
 5 Decl. Ex. 1) (“Finjan shall provide pinpoint source code citations in its Infringement  
 6 Contentions.”).

7 During meet and confer and leading up to the Case Management Conference, Finjan  
 8 argued that *Finjan, Inc. v. Proofpoint, Inc.*, No. 13-CV-05808-HSG, 2015 WL 9023166 (N.D.  
 9 Cal. Dec. 16, 2015) (“*Proofpoint II*”) justified its refusal to provide pinpoint citations. (Van Nort  
 10 Decl. Ex. 9 at 2-3.) But *Proofpoint II*’s minority position on pinpoint citations has been rejected  
 11 by at least two courts in this district. In both *FireEye* and *Check Point*, Finjan argued that  
 12 *Proofpoint II* supported its position that pinpoint source code citations are not required. (Van  
 13 Nort Decl. Exs. 18 (*FireEye*) at 3-4 and 19 (*Check Point*) at 5-8.) And in both times the judge  
 14 rejected Finjan’s erroneous reliance on *Proofpoint II* and ordered Finjan to provide pinpoint  
 15 source code citations. See *FireEye* (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 1); *Check Point*, No. 18-cv-02621-WHO,  
 16 Dkt. No. 29 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 10, 2018) (Van Nort Decl. Ex. 20.)

17 **C. Finjan’s Conclusory Doctrine of Equivalents Contentions Fail to  
 18 Provide PAN with Notice of Finjan’s Infringement Theories**

19 “The doctrine of equivalents exists to prevent fraud on the patent” and not “to give a  
 20 patentee a second shot at proving infringement” if it is not “literally present.” *Creagri, Inc. v.*  
*Pinnaclife Inc., LLC*, No. 11-CV-06635-LHK-PSG, 2012 WL 5389775, at \*6 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 2,  
 21 2012) (internal citation omitted). Therefore, “[Finjan] may not simply repeat the same boilerplate  
 22 language for each of its contentions, noting in the alternative that this element infringes directly  
 23 or under the doctrine of equivalents.” *Proofpoint*, 2015 WL 1517920, at \*10 (“strik[ing] all  
 24 language in Finjan’s infringement contentions asserting the doctrine of equivalents”) (internal  
 25 citation and quotation marks omitted). Instead, Finjan’s doctrine of equivalents contentions must  
 26 “provid[e] specific analysis, on an element-by-element basis, as to its theory of why there is  
 27 infringement under the doctrine of equivalents.” *Implicit Networks Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*,

1 No. C 10-03746 SI, 2011 WL 3954809, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 7, 2011). Finjan has not done so.

2 Finjan’s doctrine of equivalents contentions repeat the same boilerplate language that “[t]o  
3 the extent the Accused Products do not literally infringe this claim element,” they infringe under  
4 the doctrine of equivalents. (See, e.g., Appendix B-1 at 90.) Finjan then tacks on additional  
5 words that merely parrot the claim language. For example, element 1[b] of the ’731 Patent states:  
6 “a file cache for storing files that have been scanned by the scanner for future access, wherein  
7 each of the stored files is indexed by a file identifier[.]” (*Id.* at 75.) As shown below, Finjan’s  
8 doctrine of equivalents contentions simply reiterate the claim language in the guise of a function-  
9 way-result analysis:

10 The Accused Products perform the same function because they  
11 have a memory for storing files that have been scanned by the  
scanner for future access. For example, each of the Accused  
12 Products at least temporarily stores and indexes the file in a  
memory for future use.

13 The Accused Products perform this function in the same way  
14 because the stored file is indexed so that it can be retrieved for  
future access. For example, the Accused Products index the stored  
15 file by a file identifier, which can be a hash.

16 The Accused Products achieve the same result as this element  
17 because they store a scanned file in memory and index it in a way  
that it can be retrieved for future access. For example, the Accused  
18 Products allow the file to be retrieved for future use by storing files  
19 in memory and index them.

20 (*Id.* at 90.) A closer look at the contentions shows that Finjan simply rehashes the claim language  
21 in a slightly different way for each of the “function,” “way,” and “result” elements and identifies  
22 no actual link to PAN’s products at all. Finjan “merely references the entire Accused Product,  
23 rather than discrete components, as the equivalent structure that accomplishes the claimed  
24 function.” *CSR Tech. Inc. v. Freescale Semiconductor*, No. C-12-02619 RS (JSC), 2013 WL  
25 503077, at \*9 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 8, 2013) (holding that “Plaintiff must specify in what way  
26 Defendant’s products infringe under the doctrine of equivalents, or drop the contention  
27 altogether.” (internal citation and quotation marks omitted)). Nowhere does Finjan “explain  
28 where in the accused products the alleged equivalent for this element is found, or how the

1 function, way, and result of that alleged equivalent is substantially the same as the claimed  
 2 subject matter.” *Sophos*, 2015 WL 5012679, at \*4. “In essence, [Finjan] has provided no further  
 3 information to [PAN] than the claim language itself.” *Network Caching*, 2002 WL 32126128,  
 4 at \*6.

5 Additionally, Finjan lumps together three disparate lines of products—NGFW, WildFire,  
 6 and Traps—under one single “Accused Products.” (See Appendix B-1 at 1.) This is improper.  
 7 “Rule 3-1(b) does not permit parties to identify accused products by using categorical or  
 8 functional identifications.” *Geovector Corp. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 16-CV-02463-WHO,  
 9 2017 WL 76950, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2017) (“GeoVector does not identify a specific  
 10 component within a particular Samsung product that infringes but instead uses general language  
 11 to indicate that all accused products infringe the limitation at issue.”). Because Finjan “fails to  
 12 identify and differentiate between [PAN’s] products,” it “has not sufficiently articulated its  
 13 theories of infringement to put [PAN] on reasonable notice.” *Digital Reg of Texas, LLC v. Adobe*  
 14 *Sys. Inc.*, No. CV 12-01971-CW (KAW), 2013 WL 3361241, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. July 3, 2013). As  
 15 Judge Gilliam pointed out, “[i]f [Finjan] does not have a factual basis to assert the doctrine of  
 16 equivalents in its infringement contentions at [this] time, it should not do so.” *Proofpoint*, 2015  
 17 WL 1517920, at \*10.

18 **V. CONCLUSION**

19 For the foregoing reasons, PAN requests that the Court strike Finjan’s infringement  
 20 contentions in their entirety.

21 Dated: June 15, 2021

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

22  
 23  
 24 By: /s/ Colette Reiner Mayer  
 Colette Reiner Mayer

25  
 26 Attorneys for Defendant  
 27 PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.